

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Specification Objections

In the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to as not being descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, the title has been changed to "System and Method for Preventing Predicated Instructions from Delaying Execution of Consumer Instructions".

Furthermore, the Applicant was urged in the Office Action to review the specification and submit corrects for all mistakes of a grammatical, clerical, or typographical nature. Accordingly, Applicant has corrected several grammatical, clerical, and typographical mistakes found within the specification. The failure to correct any such mistakes in this Office Action response is inadvertent and is not to imply that Applicant desires these mistakes to be present in the corresponding patent as issued.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,513,109 (hereinafter "Gschwind"). Notably, it is asserted in the Office Action that Gschwind teaches all claimed limitations within independent claims 1, 9, and 14.

Presently amended claims 1,9, and 14 now reflect the limitation that renaming of registers corresponding to the predicated instructions are to be executed after a consumer instruction (ie., an instruction that depends upon the register renaming corresponding to the predicated instructions) is executed.

Gschwind, on the other hand, teaches two relevant techniques: 1) Predicting the result of the predicate within the predicated instruction such that the execution of dependent instructions are not delayed and renaming registers corresponding the predicated instruction accordingly (Col. 5, Lns. 40-43); and 2) Executing the predicated instructions regardless of whether the predicate has been resolved by choosing a predicate value and therefore renaming registers corresponding to the predicated instruction and correct any mistakes in choosing the predicate value later in the pipeline (Col. 5, Lns. 20-33).

Applicant, on the other hand, essentially claims, in presently amended claims 1, 9, and 14, delaying the renaming of registers corresponding to the predicated instructions until after any consumer (ie. Dependent) instructions are executed, thereby avoiding any delay in executing the consumer instructions.

Because the other rejected claims depend from at least one of the presently amended independent claims, and because it is believed by Applicant that the presently amended independent claims are in condition for allowance, the dependent claims are also accordingly in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Erik Metzger at (408) 653-6612.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

3/10/04



Erik M. Metzger

Registration No. 53,320

Phone No. (408) 720-8300

12400 Wilshire Blvd.

Seventh Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030